This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

**Usage guidelines**

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

**About Google Book Search**

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

THE

# MUTUAL RELATIONS

OF

# NATURAL SCIENCE AND THEOLOGY.

## AN ORATION

PRONOUNCED BEFORE THE

CONNECTICUT BETA OF THE PHI BETA KAPPA SOCIETY,

IN CHRIST CHURCH, HARTFORD, CONN.,

JULY 7TH, 1868,

BY THE

REV. WILLIAM RUDDER,

RECTOR OF ST. STEPHEN'S CHURCH, PHILADELPHIA.

---

PHILADELPHIA:
HENRY B. ASHMEAD, BOOK AND JOB PRINTER,
NOS. 1102 & 1104 SANSOM STREET.
1869.

Hosted by Google

Hosted by Google

TO

WILLIAM D. LEWIS, Esq.,

OF PHILADELPHIA,

THIS ORATION

IS,

WITH AFFECTION AND RESPECT,

INSCRIBED.

Hosted by Google

Hosted by Google

Hosted by Google

"Ut semel dicam, nemo male applicatæ sobrietatis moderationisque famam captans posse nos nimium progredi in libris sive creaturarum, theologia aut philosophia, existimet: quinimo excitent se homines, et infinitos profectus audacter urgeant utrobique et persequantur; caventes tantum ne scientia utantur ad tumorem, non ad charitatem; ad ostentionem, non ad usum; et rursus, ne distinctas illas theologiæ philosophiæque doctrinas, earumque latices, imperite misceant ac confundant."

BACON. *De Augmentis*, L. I.

"There are two sorts of ignorance: we philosophize to escape ignorance, and the consummation of our philosophy is ignorance; we start from the one, we repose in the other; they are the goals from which, and to which, we tend: and the pursuit of knowledge is but a course between two ignorances, as human life is itself only a travelling from grave to grave.

'Τίς βίος;'—Εκ τύμβοιο θορὼν, επὶ τύμβον ὀδεύω.'

"The highest reach of human science is the scientific recognition of human ignorance; 'Qui nescit ignorare, ignorat scire.' This 'learned ignorance' is the rational conviction by the human mind of its inability to transcend certain limits; it is the knowledge of ourselves—the science of man."

SIR WILLIAM HAMILTON. *Discussions*, p. 591.

Hosted by Google

# ORATION.

MR. PRESIDENT, AND GENTLEMEN OF THE PHI BETA KAPPA SOCIETY:

It is with very mingled feelings that I come before you to-day to discharge the honourable trust which you have assigned to me. Since last I appeared in this city in any connexion, direct or indirect, with Trinity College, twenty years—how large a part of the working life of man!—have glided swiftly by, and recorded themselves in the past. The lapse of such a period of time cannot have been without marked and important effects. We are changed, and all about us is changed. And yet, under the magic influences of the time, the place, and the occasion, these twenty years seem, here and to-day, but "as a dream when one awaketh," or as if their history had never been written. The gathering of these, our younger brothers, around the knees of their Alma Mater before they too go out to the dread experiences and responsibilities of life; these walls that heard my first youthful utterances, and then, afterwards, listened as I spake the most solemn vows that can bind the soul of man; these familiar faces, the

Hosted by Google

same, and yet not the same, kindling now, as in the days gone by, with generous sympathy and kindly interest, and, like lingering memories, bringing back all the scenes and associations that surrounded them in the olden time; all these things obscure the present to consciousness, and make the past, once more, a living fact to our hearts and eyes. Once more, beneath this consecrated roof, are gathered around us, rising from the silent chambers where they have slept till now, or coming from various fields of labour scattered throughout the land, the Instructors, the Friends, the Companions of our youth. Once more, the ardent boy, his heart swinging in swift oscillation between hope and fear, ascends—"Ascendat Discipulus"—to perform his last College duties in this place; and hence, from the height of the occasion and under the inspiration of it, looks eagerly and confidently forward over the coming years which, he is certain, are to be the scenes of his heroic labours and supremest enjoyments, his certain victories, and his no less certain honours and rewards. Oh, that bright forward glance of youth! that wondrous mist-tinted vision of the illimitable Elysian Fields, all sparkling with Hope's undried dew, and golden with morning! that marvellous landscape filled with the far mysterious murmur of wind-stirred forests, and bee-thronged gardens, and plashing fountains in romantic groves; lit with the shimmer of lilied lakes and winding streams; vocal

Hosted by Google

with the songs of glancing, many-plumaged birds, and fragrant with the incense of perennial flowers! Oh, that bright, too brief vision! Its rosy atmosphere seems once more to fill this place; and, through it, there come out to me the faces of the revered and the beloved. I see before me one venerable head, not more adorned by, than adorning by his Christian simplicity, his perfect urbanity, his unvarying gentleness, the honoured Mitre which he wears—the Chancellor of our College, whose very smile is Benediction, and whose every word is Love.* I see another standing by this Altar—my Pastor, my gentle Critic, and my Friend; learned, yet humble—so humble that men guess not half how learned he is; meek, yet firm—so firm in what he believes to be the right that they cannot imagine even the wells of utter tenderness that are forever springing in his breast; the man who, of all I have ever known, seems most constantly to live in an atmosphere of Heaven; the Christian Scholar, the Christian Poet, the Christian Priest—soon to be the Bishop labouring, as such an one as he must labour, through his allotted time, and then, from the calm surface of the summer seas, mounting upward to his rest in the fiery chariots of the tropic sun.† I see sitting here among his

* The Rt. Rev. Thomas Church Brownell, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Connecticut, and first Chancellor of Trinity College.

† The Rt. Rev. George Burgess, D.D., Bishop of Maine, and, before his elevation to the Episcopate, Rector of Christ

Hosted by Google

colleagues the most learned of the Governors of the College—the Historian of the Church, profoundly versed in sacred and profane letters, whose very connexion with the Institution adds strength to its position, and lustre to its fame.* I see another venerable form, erect even in old age, like some grand old pine that will not bow beneath the burden of its snows, the second President of the College, the architect of this Temple—"Si momentum requiris, circumspice"—retired now from active labours into a quiet retreat where his honourable life is slowly burning away like a summer evening into summer night.† All these and others—friends, acquaintances, companions—the living, and those we had supposed were dead, are gathered about us here to-day. Surely, Sir, it is the present and the seeming actual that are the illusions! Surely it is not 1868, but 1848!

And yet how vast and how important a period of accomplished history do these two dates enclose! What wonderful changes in the life within us, and in the life without us, does their history record! Whether we look abroad or at home, at society

Church, Hartford, Conn. Bp. Burgess died at sea, off the Island of San Domingo, April 23, 1866.

* The Rev. Samuel Farmar Jarvis, D.D., LL.D.

† The Rev. Nathaniel S. Wheaton, D.D., President of Trinity College from A.D. 1831 to A.D. 1837. Dr. Weaton had previously been Rector of Christ Church, Hartford, and, during his Rectorship, and according to plans prepared under his direction, the present Church Edifice was built.

Hosted by Google

or at the individual man, at the world of action or the world of thought; at the political events that mark their course, at the history of philosophical ideas, at the changes in religious thought and feeling; we shall scarcely find, I think, in all the chronicles of time, a period of the same limited extent more full of events pregnant with subtle influences and far-reaching effects. The Empire of the third Napoleon, which in 1848 was just cementing its foundations in the blood of the "*coup d'etat*," standing to-day, and wielding an influence wider and deeper than ever was exercised by Napoleon the First; California grown up into an American Empire on the Pacific, and throwing wide its golden gates for the passage, eastward and westward, of the traffic of the world; the Ottoman Power sustained in Europe by Christian swords wet with Christian blood; China and Japan more fully opened to commerce, and to the Christianity that is sure, sooner or later, to follow in its track; India, springing like an enraged tiger at the throat of its master, and crushed again to submission by the indomitable energies of British courage and British will; Italy freed from her old oppressors, with the Austrian driven from Venice, and the Pope confined almost to the walls of Rome; our own country deluged with fratricidal blood; Germany united; Mexico beginning to be the seat of a revived Latin influence upon this Continent, and leaving us, at last,

Hosted by Google

only the sad story of Maximilian's death, and "poor Carlotta's" fate;—these are some of the larger way-marks that show us how vast and rapid have been the world's strides, and the general direction moreover in which its present movements tend.

Nor have the events and changes in the department of Ecclesiastical History, and of philosophic and religious thought, been less marked or important. Confining our attention to our own English-speaking race, and to whatsoever exercises an influence within its bounds, we find the catalogue ready to our hands. Within these twenty years we have seen the Romish Hierarchy re-established in Britain; the dogma of the Immaculate Conception declared to be "of Faith;" the culmination of the so-called Oxford movement, with all its evil and its good; Convocation somewhat less straightened in its bonds; the Universities subjected to a criticism such as they have never known before, and evidently, with the great Public Schools, soon to be reformed; a revival of the desire for intercourse, if not for intercommunion, with the great Church of the East; the Churches of the Anglican Communion assembled, for the first time, in Council; the Irish Establishment in imminent danger of being overthrown, in order to cure the stupidities of Fenian ambition, and to appease Fenian hatred of England, in America; the rise of the Ritualistic Movement; Oxford ceased to be

Hosted by Google

Puseyite, and become largely leavened with unbelief; and, finally, a marked change in the whole tone and temper and method of unbelief itself.

In regard to this last particular, let this much more be said. It is not meant, of course, that, during this time, the general character of the attack upon Christianity has changed, for this is not the fact; but that, even during these few years, and, one might almost say, with the passage of each successive year, there has been witnessed a most marked and peculiar alteration in the whole manner and temper in which the attack has been made. The method has become continually more subtle; the purpose more discriminating; the tone more conciliatory, and so more full of peril to the cause of Truth. We all know how different in character and temper was the Infidelity of the Eighteenth Century from that of the middle of the Nineteenth. The wholesale contemptuous denial, the clumsy and superficial argumentation, as, by comparison, it seems to us to-day, the coarseness of the earlier period, had all well-nigh passed away from the later one. And so the same process of refining in its instruments and methods and manner, and of energizing through such refinement, has gone on, only in an almost greater ratio, during the period we are considering. Unbelief, to-day more than ever, does not deny, but it explains; it does not reject, but it selects; it does not scoff, but expresses even osten-

Hosted by Google

tatiously its admiration and praise. Thus, as, in regard to the authority of the Gospels and the possibility of Miracles, the argument of Hume yielded, through many transmutations, to the theory of Strauss; so, in these later days, we have seen the mythical theory of Strauss giving way to the still more subtle legendary theory which Renan has proposed. So too, the argument against Revelation supposed to be furnished by the advance of scientific discovery has been drawn more and more from remoter regions of research, until not only Geology and Physiology, but Biology, Ethnology, Philology, and Mythology itself are used, or endeavoured to be used, as witnesses against the Truth. Moreover, during the last few years, and especially through the influence of such men as Buckle and Mill, a vast extension has been given to the doctrine of the possible scientific regeneration of mankind. The former, too, has taught a most distinct and subtle materialism; endeavouring to establish the old metaphysical argument by the facts, or supposed facts, of Nature and Providence. While the so-called *scientific* method and spirit, in the strictest sense of the term, have been applied to the study of the Sacred Records themselves, and, in their misuse, have given birth to a new race of unbelievers within the limits, and, alas, in the very highest places of the Church. I cannot think it then too much to say, that, in these several respects, no similar period has wit-

Hosted by Google

nessed more radical or more important changes in the Character and Method and Temper of Unbelief, than that measured by the twenty years just drawn to a close.

And now, as we glance backward over the large array of these various changes and events, political, ecclesiastical, scientific; in the departments of Philosophy and Theology; Revolutions finished or begun, national advances or retrogressions, new discoveries of Science and new pretensions; new dogmas, and new denials; aspirations, seekings, attempts, successes, failures; and as we consider the inner life of the world, the moral principles that underlie them all, and out of which they spring; the eye of the Christian Student detects, at once, under the multiplicity of their shapes and appearances, their confusions and their contradictions, the constant on-going of the same old conflict that runs through, and is illustrated in, all the history of the World—the conflict between the hostile Kingdoms of Righteousness and Sin, of God and of all that is opposed to God. The forces may be mingled upon the field, but they fall ultimately under one or other of these two allegiances; and it needs no very close scrutiny to detect upon them the distinctive colours of the party to which they belong. But as the real source of all History is in the moral life of mankind out of which it is evolved, and which it represents, and, above all, in the *Beliefs* which lie at the root of this moral life;

Hosted by Google

so, as the great conflict goes on, we find the great principles on either side becoming more and more manifest, until, at length, we are enabled to construct certain "Formulæ," or to adopt certain terms representing them, which completely cover and express the diverse and conflicting facts. The really philosophic study of History, you will remember, begins at a very modern date. Now among these terms we have, as opposed to each other—"Authority" and "Liberty;" and these as applying not only in the sphere of action, but in the interior sphere of thought. Fallen man requires not only that he shall be free to act, but that he shall be free to think; that he shall be at liberty not only to do what he pleases, but to believe what he pleases.* The foundation of this latter liberty rests, of course, upon pride of Intellect; upon the assumed infallibility of the human understanding; and upon the extent and completeness of human knowledge. Its scientific expression is SCIENCE itself. The opposite principle of "Authority" rests ultimately—so far as it is applied to action, upon the *Divine Will;* so far as it is applied to Thought, upon the *Divine Wisdom*, expressed, of necessity, in a Divine Revelation—the scientific expression of which is THEOLOGY. So that, leaving out the class of the ignorant and self-willed—who, however worthy of attention and care from another point of view, cannot come

* See Preface to Farrar's *Critical History of Free Thought.*

Hosted by Google

within the scope of such a discussion as is now proposed—we find SCIENCE and THEOLOGY to be the formal foundations, on the one hand, of "Liberty," and on the other, of "Authority." The motive power of the Will is always *conviction* of some sort or other; and here it is, in the one case, conviction of the sufficiency of our own understanding, or, in the other, of the alone sufficiency of the wisdom of God. These, passing out into action, become, on the scale of the world, "History," on its human side, and in its human elements.

Now as the conflict between these opposed principles goes on, and as scientific discovery progresses, while Theology, by its very nature, remains unchanging and permanent, it comes to pass that there is an ever increasing restlessness under, and breaking away from, what are felt to be the restraints which Theology, in simpler and less scientific ages, was, it is said, able to impose. The successes of science increase this feeling by increasing the pride of intellect out of which it grows, and so creates, more and more, the delusion which confounds false progress with true, and which regards every breaking away from old convictions as necessarily an advance. "History," says Prof. Huxley,* "shows that the human mind, fed by constant accessions of knowledge, periodically grows too large for its theoretical coverings, and bursts them asunder to

* *Evidence as to Man's place in Nature*, p. 72.



Hosted by Google

appear in new habiliments, as the feeding and growing grub, at intervals, casts its too narrow skin and assumes another, itself but temporary. Since the revival of learning, whereby the Western races of Europe were enabled to enter upon that progress towards true knowledge which was commenced by the Philosophers of Greece, but was almost arrested in subsequent long ages of intellectual stagnation, or, at most, gyration, the human larva has been feeding vigorously and moulting in proportion. A skin of some dimension was cast in the Sixteenth Century, and another towards the end of the Eighteenth, while, within the last fifty years, the extraordinary growth of every department of physical science has spread among us mental food of so nutritious and stimulating a character that a new ecdysis seems imminent;"—an ecdysis, let me say, in Prof. Huxley's meaning, from everything which has heretofore been regarded as resting upon the authority of the Word of God.

Surely then it will be in accordance with the sanctity of the place, the spirit of the occasion, and the character of the audience composed, as it professedly is, of persons pledged to Science, and of persons pledged to Theology, if I ask your attention, for a little while, to a consideration of the General Relations which bind these two, SCIENCE and THEOLOGY, together, and which, if I may so speak, should regulate their feelings and their conduct toward each other.

Hosted by Google

It seems to me that in this, as in so many other cases, a vast amount of misunderstanding arises from a failure to begin with a clear definition of terms. What then is SCIENCE—"Science" itself, in the strictest meaning of the term? What is its scope? What are the conditions of its being?

I need not remind you, Gentlemen, that "Science" does not precede, but is the result of, the observation of known facts or phenomena. The facts in any department of the study of Nature must be thoroughly established, and must be accepted as so established, or else "Science" in that department is impossible. For doubt cannot exist in Science. Just in so far as there is any question as to the facts, and so any doubt touching our generalizations upon them, our knowledge halts below the level of Science *properly so called.* Incomplete Science is, strictly speaking, no Science; for Truth, which is the subject matter of Science, to be Truth must be absolute. We sometimes speak indeed of certain on-going discoveries and conclusions in any department of the study of Nature as Science; but this is only, as it were, by courtesy, in as much as the object of the investigation, whatever it may be, is scientific, or it is carried on by scientific methods, or for scientific ends. But "Science," like "Truth" itself, is absolute; and there is no proper Science without the absoluteness of Truth. Thus it comes to pass in the evolution of each particular Science, that there is confessedly a period, longer or shorter, when the

Hosted by Google

work is simply tentative, and when the instrument used is not the Understanding which judges and determines, but the Imagination which forecasts and theorizes, and deals in hypothesis. Take one or two illustrations. The diurnal revolution of the earth around its axis existed as an "hypothesis" in the human mind long before the invention of the telescope had established its truth. So far back as the time of Pythagoras the apparent motions of the heavenly bodies had been thus explained; and even after the idea had again, in the second dawn of Science, beamed on the mind of Copernicus, it was still held as a mere theory by more than one Astronomer up to the day when Galileo finally removed it from the region of speculation to that of ascertained and accepted fact. A similar history belongs to the Law of Gravitation. This Law existed, for a long time, simply as an hypothesis in the mind of Newton himself;* and so strictly was this the case, that he actually abandoned it because of the wrong results brought out in his calculations by his adoption of the then received length of a degree on the earth's surface.† The suppositions of "a force tending to the Sun and varying inversely as the square of the distance; of a mutual force between all the bodies

* "That very excellent and divine theorist, Mr. Isaac Newton."—Dr. Bentley's *Boyle Lectures*, Serm. vii., 221. These Lectures were delivered in London, in 1692.

† Brewster's *Memoirs of Sir Isaac Newton*.—Vol I., p. 290.

Hosted by Google

of the Solar System; of the force of each body arising from the attraction of all its parts;" were all hypotheses both with Newton and with Kepler before him, and continued to be so, until by the subsequent measurements of Picard they were enabled to be verified and proved. There are, indeed, at this very day, teachers of Philosophy of great and wide influence, who, as did Hegel of Berlin, entirely reject the doctrine of Newton in this matter, and deny the validity of the proofs that are commonly adduced in support of it.* Thus, in the progress towards the establishment both of the doctrine of the diurnal revolution of the Earth, and of the Law of Gravitation, we find a period, even of considerable extent,† when each of them is held confessedly as a mere hypothesis, and when indeed only hypothesis in regard to them is possible. And this holds generally true. When Newton was once asked why it was that he saw so much more clearly than other men into the laws of nature, he replied, that, if it were so, it resulted from his keeping his thoughts steadily occupied upon the subject which was to be thus penetrated. But "what," asks Whewell, "is this occupation of

* See Whewell *On the Philosophy of Discovery*. Appendix H.

† Newton conceived the idea of the Law of Gravitation in the autumn of 1665. Picard's measurement of the earth was executed in 1670, and the method and result of it were communicated to the Royal Society in January, 1672. Newton did not "resume his former thoughts concerning the moon" till 1684.—See Brewster's *Memoirs of Newton*, I. 291, 292.

Hosted by Google

the thoughts, if it be not the process of keeping the phenomena clearly in view, and trying, one after another, all the plausible hypotheses which seem likely to connect them, till at last the true law is discovered?" Hypotheses are thus a necessary, and a confessedly necessary element of discovery; but our knowledge, or supposed knowledge, does not become "Science" until it has passed beyond and above this lower level of theory and guess. Let then these two things be observed:—that the evolution of Science itself leads through a period of question and contradiction; and, above all, that Science, as Science, is based upon, and grows only out of, *the absolute certainty of facts*.

Natural Science then—and all Science is, in the last analysis, either natural or supernatural*—i. e. it concerns itself with the natural or the supernatural—is thus based upon *known facts in nature*, and is occupied with their Laws and Relations. It is the Science of Nature. It concerns itself with, and, in so far as it is complete, as it is "Science," expresses, the Laws of Nature in each and all of her departments; of man physical and intellectual; of the animal, mineral, and vegetable kingdoms; of matter in all its varieties of form and existence, and of the forces that shape and rule the world.

* This old division is, of course, sneered at by some of our modern Philosophers. See some very striking remarks on this subject in Bushnell's *Nature and the Supernatural*, Ch. II.

Hosted by Google

"Theology," which at once carries us up into the region of the Supernatural, is, of course, in its simplest literal definition, the "Science of God." It is evident, however, that, in our present work, we shall need a fuller and more complete definition than this. But observe, before going further, that Theology is a SCIENCE.

We must accept this doctrine, unless we are prepared to reject entirely the human Understanding as a legitimate and most valuable instrument in our search after the knowledge of God, and so to sink into utter Philosophic Scepticism. It is true, that the facts of the Divine Revelation must be taken hold of by Faith; but it is also true, that this Faith must itself rest upon a rational basis—that is, we must be able to give a reason for the faith that is in us—or else, as Archbishop Whately observes, "our Faith would be no whit better than that of a heathen." Undoubtedly, Faith may be viewed simply on its moral side, and so may fulfil the definition of Pascal, that "Faith is God sensibly realized by the heart;" but it is no less certain that it may be, and at times must be, viewed from the stand-point of Philosophy. If proof of this be wanting, we have it in the fact that Faith, even in its strictly moral sense, has been, and often is, led up to and reached by a pathway of strictly scientific convictions. It is indeed part of the wealth of God's mercy, that He has placed Faith within the reach of all, in

Hosted by Google

permitting it to take its origin from any one of the moral elements that constitute it; not only through an absolute submission to Authority, as the Romish Doctors teach; nor only by the prompting of the emotions, according to the Mystics; but also by a proper use of the Understanding exercising itself upon the evidences of Revelation, of whatever sort, with which evidences it builds the foundation for Faith in those Facts of the Revelation which it is not competent to consider, nor able, in any way, to comprehend. Theology then is a "Science," and it is "The Science of God."

In order to reach the fuller definition which we seek, let us observe—What Theology is not; which will best open the way to the positive question—What Theology is.

Theology then is not, or rather it is more than what is commonly known as "Natural" or, sometimes, as "Physical Theology;"—the knowledge, that is, of God derived from His works, and which many persons desire to substitute for Revelation.

One would think that it hardly needed to be shown, that the study of nature, in any or in all of its parts, cannot, by itself, teach us either a certainly true, or a complete doctrine of God. It is true that man is so created in the image of his Maker, that he is prepared to believe in a God, to feel after Him,* to recognize Him when dis-

* *Acts* xvii. 27.

Hosted by Google

covered; but it is no less certain that, by himself, he cannot find Him. We may believe, with Plato and Augustin, with Kant and Coleridge, in the existence in man of an intuitive faculty by which he is able to apprehend the Eternal and Absolute Truth—the True, the Beautiful, and the Good; allowing the distinction between the "Reason" (νοῦς) and the "Understanding" (λογος or διάνοια); but we must remember that the office of this faculty is simply to guarantee. Man cannot, through this instrument, excogitate a God.* Nay more, he cannot, before hand, determine anything concerning the being or character of God; any more than through the faculty of sight, one, deprived of the organ of vision, or of illumination from without, can become informed concerning the varied appearances, the endless diversities of light and shadow, that play upon the surface of the external world. The office in the case of either capacity is simply to recognize its object when that object is put before it; or, at most, to detect and interpret the evidences of the existence of that object among the facts with which it may be acquainted. So Nature, in its consecutive developments, in the order of its operations, may suggest a "First Cause;" its design, an "Intelligent Ruler;" Conscience in man, a "Moral Governor." Doubtless man, as a being endowed with Understanding and Conscience, would be competent to such a realization. But all this furnishes

* See Garbett's *Bampton Lectures*, Sect. iv.

Hosted by Google

us with no satisfactory idea of God. God must be more than an Abstraction; more than First Cause; more even than Moral Ruler. To see the extent and value of the knowledge of God derivable from the sources referred to, we need only look at the Gods of the most acute and cultivated nations of antiquity—Gods with whom, whether viewed intellectually or morally, there is probably not one of us who would be willing to associate.* The fact is, that with our faces turned to nature alone, there are only two possible positive modes of knowing God—the first, as has been said, by an intuition of His infinity—this intuition, however, being wholly, and, of necessity, destitute of attributes, and so, prior to experience, wanting in the clearness and definiteness of an intellectual conception; and the second, by apprehending His infinity antecedently to the application of limitations to it—which is simply Pantheism. We come, therefore, as it seems to me, to the inevitable conclusion, that if

* Mr. Gladstone, holding the view that even the dimmed and imperfect elements of Truth in the Religion of the Homeric Age, were the remains of a primitive tradition, remarks that—"The stream darkened more and more as it got farther from the source. The Pagan Religion could boast of its unbroken traditions; like some forms of Christianity, and like the government of France until 1789. But its uninterrupted course was really an uninterrupted aberration from the line of truth; and to boast of the evenness of its motion was in effect to boast of the deadness of the conscience of mankind, which had not virtue enough even to disturb progressive degeneracy by occasional reproach."—*Homer and the Homeric Age*, Vol. II., p. 17.

Hosted by Google

we are to have any knowledge, any Science of God, it must come, and can only come to us through a DIVINE REVELATION. A true Theology, therefore, must rest upon Revelation, and upon the *facts* made known to us by Revelation. If you reject the Revelation, or the revealed facts, there can be no "Theology." "Theology" then is not Natural Religion.

And now we come to the positive question, and ask—"What Theology is."

In its simplest definition, as we have seen, it is the "Science of God." But here comes before us another, and the most important term of all—"GOD."

And here I shall not hesitate to borrow, so far as it applies to my present purpose, I will not impiously any the definition, but the language expressing some of the particulars necessarily included in any definition of this awful term—the exact and eloquent language of John Henry Newman. "When," he says, "I speak of God, I mean the Creator, Upholder, Governor, and Sovereign Lord of the World. I mean one who is simply self-dependent, and the only Being who is such; moreover that He is without beginning or Eternal, and the only Eternal; that in consequence He has lived a whole eternity by Himself; and hence that He is all-sufficient, sufficient for His own blessedness, and all-blessed, and ever-blessed. I mean one who is sovereign over His own will and actions, though always according to the eternal

Hosted by Google

Rule of right and wrong, which is Himself. I mean moreover that He created all things out of nothing, and preserves them every moment, and could destroy them as easily as He made them; and that, in consequence, He is separated from them by an abyss, and is incommunicable in all His attributes. I mean too, that He is ever present with His works, one by one, and confronts everything He has made by his particular and most loving providence, and manifests Himself to each according to its needs; and has on rational beings imprinted the moral law, and given them power to obey it, imposing on them the duty of worship and service, and putting before them a present trial and a judgment to come. His are all beings visible and invisible, the noblest and the vilest. His are the substance and the operation and the results of that system of physical nature into which we are born. The laws of the universe, the principles of truth, the relation of one thing to another, their qualities and virtues, the order and harmony of the whole, all that exists, is from Him. All we see, hear, and touch, the elements which compose all things and the ordinances they obey, are His. The primary atoms of matter, their properties, their mutual action, their disposition and collocation, electricity, magnetism, gravitation, light, and whatever other subtle principles or operations the wit of man is detecting or shall detect, are the work of His hands.

Hosted by Google

And so in the intellectual, moral, social, and political world. Man with his motives and works, his languages, his propagation, his diffusion, is from Him. Agriculture, Medicine, and the arts of life are His gifts. Society, Laws, Government, He is their sanction. Peace and civilization, commerce and adventure, wars when just, conquest when humane and necessary, have His co-operation, and His blessing upon them. The course of events, the revolution of Empires, the rise and fall of States, the periods and eras, the progresses and retrogressions of the world's history, not indeed the incidental sin, overabundant as it is, but the great outlines and the issues of human affairs, are from His disposition. All that is good, all that is true, all that is beautiful, be it great or small, be it perfect or fragmentary, natural as well as supernatural, moral as well as material, comes from Him."*

This then is the doctrine of God, chiefly in His relations to Nature and Providence—for it is with these that we are now especially concerned—which Theology teaches.† It puts these several points before us as Facts, and on these Facts, it rests its claims to be, and to be regarded as a

* *The Scope and Nature of University Education*, p. 80.

† The argument, I need scarcely say, while here, for the sake of brevity, limited to the doctrine of God the Creator and Ruler, applies equally to the whole Revelation of God contained in Holy Scripture.

Hosted by Google

"Science." If you reject its authority, and so its claim, then you can be certified of these vast and necessary facts from no other source, by no other Teacher; and you break, moreover, the fundamental principle of all scientific inquiry, that the Theory which covers, combines harmoniously, and so explains the greatest number of facts, must be regarded as at least *hypothetically true*, until by experiment, or by further knowledge, it is proved to be false. But the believers in Revelation claim that it covers *all* the facts. The unbeliever or the Sceptic, therefore, who cannot, and indeed does not deny that it covers, or seems to cover, a vast array of them, must be prepared, in order to his own *philosophic justification*, not only to show that it does not cover *all* the facts, but, further, to give us a theory which does cover and explain *a confessedly still greater number of them*. If the very lowest ground be taken, still Theology is as much a Science as Geology, or indeed, any other admitted Science; for these are each and all in precisely the same predicament. Theology, therefore, in any case, is a "Science;" and it is the "Science of God," or of divine facts and relations.

I have heretofore, you will observe, adopted the common, loose forms of speech, and spoken of "Science" and "Theology." The exclusive assignment of the word "Science" to the results of the study of the facts of the natural world, indi-

Hosted by Google

cates the unquestionably common belief, that precision of knowledge, or any knowledge based upon ascertained facts, belongs to, and is only possible in, the department of nature.* The natural alone is the knowable. But we have seen, I think, that Theology is a Science, or claims to be a Science. The true expression, therefore, is "The Science of Nature," and "The Science of that which lies back of Nature, above it and apart from it, and yet absolutely shaping and ruling it—of God, or of divine facts and relations."

But if both of these branches of knowledge are thus "Sciences," then they will have certain necessary relations to each other, and will—be-

* "Science, however, can take no note of the Supernatural, unless it becomes natural, and takes the oath of allegiance to nature. Nature itself is too Supernatural to require any additions from the realms of human ignorance."—*Man's Origin and Destiny*, by J. P. Lesley, p. 164.

"What this or that man may understand by a governing Reason, an absolute power, a universal soul, a personal God, etc., is his own affair. The Theologians, with their Articles of Faith, must be left to themselves; so the Naturalists with their Science; they both proceed by different routes. The province of Faith rests in human dispositions which are not accessible to Science; and even for the Conscience of the individual, it does not appear impossible to keep Faith and Science separate. A respectable Naturalist lately gave the ingenuous advice that we should keep two Consciences, a Scientific and a religious Conscience, which for the peace of our mind we should keep perfectly separate, as they cannot be reconciled. This process is now known by the technical expression of "book-keeping by double entry."—Buchner's *Kraft und Stoff*, p. 43.

Hosted by Google

cause, as such, they must—exercise certain necessary influences upon each other, and will, moreover, have certain principles or Laws in common. This is characteristic of all Science, and of all the Sciences. There is not only a general connexion and mutual influence between them, as both Plato and Cicero long ago observed; but, besides this, they constantly—to use the word of Herbert Spencer—"inosculate,"—that is, the very life-blood, as it were, of each science flows into, and becomes part and parcel of the life of every other Science.*

In the first place, then, since the subject matter of Science is *universal Truth—the knowable however to be known*—Science must recognize and embrace "Theology" as part of that "Truth" or "knowledge" with which it professes to be concerned. Even if it be claimed that Science is concerned only with Nature, and with man as part of Nature, this still follows; for "Man" cannot be known apart from his relations to God. Nay, more than this may be said. "No philosophy of Science can be complete," as Whewell observes, "which is not also a philosophy of the universe; and no philosophy of the universe can satisfy thoughtful men, which does not include a reference to the power by which the universe came to be what it is."

As matter of fact, admitted up to a certain

* See Prof. Baden Powell's *Unity of Worlds*, for some striking illustrations of this truth.

Hosted by Google

limited and superficial extent, Theology, even in the present day, has a manifest influence upon natural Science, and natural Science, on the other hand, an unquestioned and unquestionable influence upon Theology. The former, as might be anticipated, holds true especially in regard to the Science of man; for it is not too much to say, that any Anthropology framed without the assistance of Revelation would involve itself in hopeless absurdity from the very start. The illustrations of the latter fact are abundant enough. To say nothing of the influence of the Aristotelian Philosophy upon the Theology of the middle ages, and of the introduction of its very phraseology into the technical language of the Church; we know that the meaning of large and important parts of Scripture is influenced or determined by the researches of the Antiquary, the explorations of the Traveller, the discoveries of the Astronomer and the Geologist; and we may still further believe—as, I think, Prof. Max Muller has shown—that yet newer assistance is to be derived from the adult powers of the now infant Sciences of Ethnology and Philology, and even of Scientific Mythology.*

In the first place, unless we are prepard to cast out Theology entirely from the circle of the Sciences, or—which, as we have seen, amounts to the same thing—to deny wholly the truth and authority of the Revelation on which it rests, and

* *Chips from a German Workshop.*



Hosted by Google

which it represents—and few persons, I think, even among professed Sceptics, will be willing to go quite to this extent—such a science, not only because it treats of the very foundation of things, but because it has thus confessedly, even though it be but in a very limited degree, a certain divine sanction and authority, must have, of necessity, a very important place in any plan of the study of the universe. Give to Theology the very lowest place that you can or will, still, as concerned with God, and with man in his spiritual parts and relations, it is the highest Truth—higher than any philosophy of the material Creation, and, as such, must, of necessity, affect every other branch of knowledge which is, as all are, inferior to itself. It will not be denied that there is such a scale of relative importance even in the purely Natural Sciences. Navigation, for example, is subordinate to Astronomy; Astronomy to the Science of the pure Mathematics; and the Astronomer himself, in his work, is debtor to the Metaphysician. And so it is but natural to anticipate, that each and all of the Sciences should, in some way or other, direct or indirect, and in some degree or other, be influenced by Theology, which ranks higher than them all. At all events, until its claims are entirely broken down; until the Bible is proved to be a work of fiction, and the idea of Revelation a dream; it is not only rash, but unphilosophic, to assume, as is so often done, that it can have, and more-

Hosted by Google

over that it ought to have, no respectful recognition from scientific men. It is true that the Bible is not a volume of natural Science; but if Theology be a Science at all, there must be between it and the natural Sciences a certain general concordance and harmony—the absence at least of any permanent and irreconcilable contradictions between them; and it is a wise prudence, to say no more, not absolutely to reject its authority, and treat its assertions with contempt.

There is another reason too why Science, in the interest of Science itself, should not only be willing to allow to, but should persistently claim for Theology, its proper place in the circle of Truth. Nothing has been more clearly established than this—that if any one Science is deposed from its proper throne, the others, by a sort of natural impulse, usurp its place, and, causing universal detriment, attempt to give laws in a region where they have no rightful authority. We all know how this has been the case in former times, when Theology has exceeded her proper functions, and, denouncing Science, has ventured to dogmatize in regard to physical truth. It is to this cause more than to any other, brought about, as he says, by "the ignorance of divines," and by what he justly calls "a blind and immoderate zeal for religion," that Lord Bacon, in the "Novum Organum," ascribes the marvellous intellectual torpor of the middle ages, and the absence of everything like Scientific dis-

Hosted by Google

covery.* How indeed could it be otherwise in a period "when innovation of every kind was regarded as a crime, and superior knowledge excited only terror and suspicion; when speculation was heresy, and the study of nature was magic; when not even the dignity of the Popedom was able to save Sylvester I. from the perilous reputation of a magician, and when the magnificent labours of Roger Bacon were repaid by fourteen years of imprisonment, and many others of less severe but unremitting persecution."† The effect of this intrusive and cruelly dogmatizing temper of the old Theology has been conspicuously shown upon more than one occasion. Had the doctrine, for example, of the "Antipodes," proposed as early as the close of the fifth Century, and opposed and denounced, at that time, as Manichæan heresy, and again announced by Virgilius in the eighth Century, been left to take care of itself as a part of natural Science, who shall say that the shape of the earth might not have been established at a far earlier period, and that its establishment might not have opened the way for the entrance of much related and most important truth. Or if, in a later age, the revolution of the earth around its axis had been recognized as lying beyond the proper bounds of theological authority, who shall deny that the great discoveries of Galileo might not have been ante-

* *Novum Organum*, lxxxix.

† Lecky's *Rationalism in Europe*, Vol. I., pp. 282, 283.

Hosted by Google

dated, and mankind made rich with this knowledge long before the time of the Florentine Astronomer? Certainly it is a fact, that Tycho Brahe, although he adopted the Copernican doctrine of the motion of the planets about the sun, refused, precisely on the ground of the declared hostility of Theology to that truth, to acknowledge the annual and diurnal revolutions of the earth. And in the case of Galileo himself—the Cranmer of Science—we see the retarding and damaging, if not the destroying influence of this mistaken and ignorant zeal on the part of Theology.*

No one whose fortune has led him to Florence—next to Rome the world's great capital of Art—has failed to visit the Basilica of Santa Croce; and no one who has wandered among the splen-

* It was only in 1818 that the writings of Galileo were removed from the *Index Expurgatorius;* nor even then without opposition. The saying of Cardinal Baronius will be remembered, that "the intention of the Holy Spirit was to teach how to go to heaven, not how heaven goes. 'Come si vada al Cielo, e non come vada il Cielo.'"

The kind of argument with which Galileo was met, is well illustrated in the following extract from one of his letters, quoted by Tiraboschi—"En chemin, il (P. Lancio, commissaire du Saint-Office,) me fit diverses questions, et me montra un grand desir que je reparasse le scandale que j'avais donne a toute l'Italie, en soutenant l'opinion du mouvement de la terre; et a toutes les raisons mathematiques que je pouvais lui opposer, il ne me repondait pas autre chose, sinon: *Terra autem in æternum stabit, quia terra in æternum stat*, comme dit l'Ecriture."—*Biographie Universelle.* Art. Galileo.

Hosted by Google

dours of that noble shrine, at once the Pantheon and the Westminster Abbey of mediæval and modern Italy, has failed to linger long and thoughtfully before the monument of Gallileo Gallilei. On every side of the spectator are crowded the treasures of Italian art: the Church itself—its walls and pillars and arches glowing with costly marbles, and rising, amid all their exuberance of ornament, in such exquisite proportion to meet the vast width and height of the surmounting dome, that they seem to inclose him, as it were, within the petrified harmonies of some grand Anthem suddenly arrested in its ascent, and changed to stone; pictures, by whose magic power he is carried back into the heroic ages of the Church, and made a witness of the great deeds and sufferings and devotions of multitudes of Martyrs and Saints; statues, which, reversing the story of Niobe, seem to be transformed into living women and men, and to weep unceasingly the bitter tears of the world's great loss over some of the noblest and greatest of her sons—Scholars, Poets, Patriots, Statesmen, Artists, Priests, whose gathered dust adds a lesser consecration to the place;—all these things are around, and above, and below him—their fascination breathes upon him in the very air; and yet among them all—through the colossal memorials of Dante and Alfieri are within his sight—there is no spot more attractive, none that possesses a stronger or more lasting hold upon the

Hosted by Google

mind, the imagination, and the heart, than that where, beneath the marble floor, sleeps the great "Tuscan Artist." Persecuted through life, imprisoned, possibly tortured,* because, as Milton says, "he dared to think in Astronomy otherwise than the Dominican and Franciscan licencers thought,"† the sculptured marble which personal friendship has erected to his memory stands, to-day, not only a monument to himself, but a witness, and a prophecy moreover, of the certain ultimate triumph of Science, acting within its proper bounds, over the interferences and oppositions of an ignorant and conceited Theology—nay, more than this, utters, in every hour, to crowds of passing Priests as ignorant and as cruel too, if they dared to be, as any of their predecessors, that Theology, passing beyond the limits which her divine Author has evidently set to her, and intruding with arrogant dictation into any other department of His Empire, becomes, in so far, an instrument of evil, paralyzing the intellect, and hindering the wholesome progress of mankind.

But, while this is so, let us not forget that there

* The opinion that Galileo was subjected to bodily torture is founded upon the following passage in his Sentence: "Cum vero nobis videretur non esse a te integram veritatem pronunciatam circa tuam intentionem; judicavimus necesse esse venire ad *rigorosum examen* tui, in quo respondisti catholice."—The question is discussed in the *Biographie Universelle*. Art. *Galileo*.—M. Biot, the author, takes the negative.

† *Areopagitica*. Prose Works, Vol. II., p. 82.

Hosted by Google

is another side to this matter. If the influence of Theology thus interfering in the department of Natural Science is so hurtful, the effect of the intrusion of Natural Science into the province of Theology, and the application of its laws and principles to the supernatural facts of Revelation, is ten thousand times more disastrous. And yet the tendency to this is as constant as the opportunities, especially in our own day, and, alas, the instances of it, are numerous. There is scarcely a Science which the pride of man may not, or does not, make guilty of such intrusion. Abelard, the great representative of the dialectical tendencies of the twelfth century, applies the nominalist philosophy to the doctrine of the Trinity, and the result is, that, by this misapplication of Logic, he is betrayed into the denial of that doctrine.* Philology, in many hands, is being made to-day, what John Horne Tooke made it in the last century, an instrument and an agency of unbelief. Jeremy Bentham makes a treatise on Judicial Proofs a covert attack upon the miracles of Revelation.† History and Physiology deny moral evil and human responsibility. Geology, Ethnology, Arithmetic overthrow Moses. Even Architecture, in its archaic forms, casts suspicion upon the history of Genesis.

* See Neander. *History of the Christian Religion and Church*, Vol. IV., p. 371.

† See Newman's *University Education*, from which some of the instances given above are taken.

Hosted by Google

Perverted Science has thus been, in every age, alike the cause and the instrument of unbelief and misbelief, from Paulus of Samosata, a Sophist by profession, down to the last of the European or British Sceptics, or of their limping American imitators. And the terrible consequences of this perversion or degradation, it certainly will not be necessary for me to enlarge upon—the breaking up of the very foundations of Society, the quenching of every high hope and aspiration in the heart of man, the loss of the soul.

These then, as it seems to me, are the general relations in which Theology and Natural Science stand to each other. This conclusion then appears to be evident—that, as we should naturally anticipate harmony between them, so the absence of it must arise either, first, from the improper interference of the one with the other; or, secondly, from a confusion of their subjects brought about by ignorance of each other; or, thirdly, from distinctly moral causes.

I fear, Mr. President and Gentlemen, that I have severely taxed your good nature, and exhausted your patience. Permit me, however, very briefly indeed to indicate one or two principles which Science and Theology, because of their relation as Science, seem to have in common.

In the first place, it is an admitted principle in the Philosophy of Science, that the human mind is not to be made the measure of Nature. Take

Hosted by Google

a single illustration. In the philosophy of M. Comte, the natural Sciences are disposed in a linear arrangement; that is, they are viewed as being evolved one from the other in what he calls "the true *filiation* of the Sciences." Herbert Spencer overthrows the position of the French philosopher in this particular, by simply showing that this theory is not a conclusion from the study of nature, but a purely metaphysical conception; and proves that his error arises from making the laws and conditions of the human mind the absolute measure of the world which is outside of it. Here is the fallacy—"We are obliged to think in sequence, it is the law of our minds that we must consider things separately, one after another; *therefore* nature must be serial, and *therefore* the Sciences must be classifiable in a succession."* Unquestionably, the doctrine of Comte is a philosophical one, viewed simply from the stand-point of the mind; so much so, that, as Spencer has shown, it contains a considerable element of truth; but the moment it is brought out of the mind, and made a Law for the interpretation of Nature, the *facts* of nature, which cannot, like those of Revelation, be denied or resolved into myths or legends, prove it to be false. Now, if this principle holds true in nature; if the human mind is not to be made the measure of *nature;* must it not hold true, true as a *scientific principle*, only in a far higher degree, in regard to Revelation?

* Herbert Spencer's *Illustrations of Universal Progress*, p. 144.

Hosted by Google

Again; I would have you notice this peculiarity in the history of scientific discovery. The mind of man, with each fresh discovery of Science, passes upward from one level of possessed ideas, and so of intellectual capacity, to another that is wider and higher; which two conditions however, prior to experience, could not have been conceived of as naturally or logically connected—and simply, because *the intermediate steps connecting the two were not known.* Often indeed the two seem not merely unconnected, but impossible to be connected. Take the illustration nearest to hand. There is no difficulty for any of us to-day in conceiving the truth of the heliocentric theory of our system; and yet, before Astronomy had revealed to the mind the numerous intermediate steps that lead up from the natural view to this truth, some of the acutest intellects rejected it as impossible, contradictory alike to logical conclusions based on the then known facts of the case, and to the evidence of the senses. And there is not a branch of science that does not furnish us with similar illustrations. Is not the inference then plain? Would it not be wise, would it not be *scientific*, for men to pause before they determine that any declared fact of Revelation can not be true, because, rising above the *present limits of knowledge*, above therefore the *present capacity of thought*, it contradicts, or seems to contradict, their present formulas and conclusions, and so to be impossible.

Hosted by Google

with the deepening of the night," shall come to us the voice of the dead past and yet of the living present—the voice of the one unbroken stream of undying Catholic Truth."

Hosted by Google